DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 109 895 FL 006 881

AUTHOR Gribble, Charles E.
TITLE Priorities for the Slavic Languages.
PUB DATE Oct 74
NOTE 11p.; Paper presented at the Conference on Material Development Needs in the Uncommonly Taught Languages: Priorities for the 70's (Columbia, Maryland, September 29-October 2, 1974)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$1.58 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Albanian; Bibliographies; Bielorussian; Bulgarian; Contrastive Linguistics; Czech; Dictionaries; Information Needs; *Instructional Materials; *Language Instruction; Language Skills; Latvian; Lithuanian; *Material Development; Polish; Programed Materials; Reading Materials; Reading Skills; Reference Materials; Resource Materials; Second Language Learning; Serbocroatian; *Slavic Languages; Slovenian; Ukrainian; *Uncommonly Taught Languages
IDENTIFIERS Macedonian; *Neglected Languages Materials Conference 1974; Slovak

ABSTRACT

The changing situation in the world and in academia requires a new perspective on priorities for Slavic language instructional materials. For example, courses must be developed that concentrate on reading skills, the main skill today's students of Slavic languages generally require. Materials needed for Slavic languages can be grouped into 16 categories, which include texts, reference grammars, readers, contrastive materials, dictionaries, phrase books and vocabulary lists, word counts, and annotated bibliographies. The necessity of each of these categories for each Slavic language must then be determined according to three factors: the relative importance of the language, the relative importance of the type of materials, and the degree to which existing materials are satisfactory. When these factors are considered in relation to the 12 languages under discussion here, the following priorities for the production of further materials emerge. First priority goes to basic four-skill courses for Albanian, Byelorussian, Latvian, Macedonian, Slovak and Slovenian; reference grammars for all the languages except Czech, Polish and Slovenian; full-size dictionaires for Albanian and Byelorussian in both directions, Latvian-English, Lithuanian-English and Macedonian-English; and bibliographies for all the languages; second-year materials for Polish, Czech, Serbo-Croatian and Bulgarian; and readers for some of the languages. (AM/KM)

ED109895

Charles E. Gribble

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Priorities for the Slavic Languages*

Before we can decide what materials are still needed for the Slavic languages, we must consider the question of what needs those materials are to meet. It is self-evident that the situation in both "academia" and the "real world" in 1974 is quite different from what it was in 1961, at the time of the last conference. The financial crisis in higher education and the changing relationships between the United States and Eastern Europe, to name only two factors, have altered radically both the setting in which the Slavic languages are taught and the purposes for which people study them.

In 1961 we faced the problem of preparing a relatively large number of teachers for the uncommonly taught languages and providing them with the necessary materials to carry on teaching. The emphasis was, understandably, on preparing specialists in those languages, who could then in turn teach the languages. While our personnel problems have not been solved entirely during the past dozen years, we have made great progress, and in 1974 the main problem is to prepare people who will put their knowledge of these languages to use in business and industry, government, tourism, and fields of research and education other than philology. In 1961 the main emphasis was upon materials for regular full-time students, both graduate and undergraduate, who were prepared to devote most of their time for several years to the study of one or more Slavic languages and cultures. Provision must still be made for this group now, but an ever-larger portion of our potential students is made up of businessmen, government workers, and scholars who require the knowledge of a specific language for very practical purposes and who cannot spend long periods away from their regular work in order to acquire it.

Many full-time students also find themselves in a situation where the traditional courses and materials are of little use: they cannot take a year or two off from their studies to attend another school that teaches a language they need, but which is not taught at their own school. At Indiana University, for example, we have students in the History and Anthropology departments who require a knowledge of Slovak, Slovenian, and Macedonian for their research. None of these languages is taught at Indiana University now, and limitations of time and money make it impossible for these students to take one or two years to go to another university to learn the languages through traditional three- or four- or five-hour per week courses. These students, no less than businessmen or other professionals, need either suitable self-instructional materials or intensive, short-term courses with appropriate materials.

FL006881

There is a second problem of audience which arises in the study of Slavic languages other than Russian. Many students begin a "minor" Slavic language with a good command of Russian. Less commonly a student begins a Slavic language with previous knowledge of some Slavic language other than Russian. In all such cases, the learner already is familiar with most of the things that cause trouble for the average English-speaking student of a Slavic language, such as verbal aspect, a complicated system of declension, and completely strange roots, prefixes, and suffixes. The Slavic languages are close enough to each other that a knowledge of one can cut by at least 50% the time needed to learn another, but the teaching materials must take this into account. Materials which do not make use of previous knowledge of another Slavic language waste the student's time and usually bore him to the point of insanity. On the other hand, materials

*Prepared in September of 1974 for the Office of Education's Conference on Material Development Needs in the Uncommonly Taught Languages; some of the recommendations here are already out of date due to the appearance of new materials since the paper was written.

which assume a knowledge of Russian will leave students without that knowledge baffled, and they will learn the language badly, if at all. Although there have been several attempts to write materials, mostly elementary textbooks, which are useful to both groups of students, I do not know of any that can be called successful.

It should be added that materials written for those with a knowledge of Russian must not only point out how the new language is similar to Russian, but also how it differs. Otherwise, students will make errors by using Russianisms in the new language instead of or in addition to Anglicisms. Such errors are in no way less serious just because they are caused by another Slavic language, and in certain contexts extra-linguistic factors can actually make them worse than Anglicisms. At the present time, a Russianism in Czech is much more likely to evoke a negative reaction than an Anglicism is.

In the past there has been an implicit assumption by most textbook writers that every student was at least as interested in learning to speak a language as in learning to read it, and often more so. It is very clear today that many people need to be able to read a language but have little opportunity, if any, to speak it. The political scientist may wish to read Pravda, Rudé Právo, Borba, or Otečestven Front, but he may seldom if ever have the opportunity to discuss the contents with persons from the country where they are published. Moreover, since learning to speak a language is a far more difficult and lengthy process than learning to read it, a person can learn to read three or four Slavic languages in the time it takes to achieve reasonable conversational fluency in a single one. We must produce courses that concentrate on developing reading skills, since they are what many language-learners of the 1970's and 1980's need. Language and literature specialists have too long assumed that everybody else shares their goals of four-skill fluency.

The content of language courses has also usually been aimed at the philologist: they are full of excerpts from poetry and novels, with detailed information on the lives and work of important (and not-so-important!) writers, but they often give absolutely no information on the history, geography, political and social structure, folklore, economics, etc. of the country where the language is used. This not only leaves the student ignorant of basic information about the users of the language and the way they live, it also means that he may have real trouble the first time he tries to read a newspaper or history text or tries to talk to someone from that country. We must adjust our textbooks to include a variety of information, which means a variety of styles and language levels as well. One of the few textbooks to do this systematically is Carleton Hodge's *Serbo-Croatian Basic Course* in two volumes.

Another important area is secondary-school language teaching. Any high-school language teacher can testify to the fact that many materials which work well in college do not succeed in high schools, and college materials virtually never meet the needs of students in grade school and junior high school. As far as I know, materials for secondary-school students exist only for Russian, although many areas have groups of students who want to learn Polish, Serbo-Croatian, or another of the Slavic languages. The teaching of languages other than Latin, French, Spanish, and German in the secondary schools has become much more frequent in the last 15 years, but almost nothing has been done in the Slavic field to meet the needs of such classes. Even for Russian many of the necessary materials are not available.

A further criterion in deciding what we need in teaching materials is connected not with the intended audience, but with the problem of teaching personnel. Even where a college or university has a person qualified to teach an uncommon language, it often will not permit him to do so because it is too expensive. If a professor making $20,000 per year teaches two courses per semester and one of those is an uncommon language to six students the cost per student is $833. Very few schools can afford this, particularly with the current squeeze on budgets. There is a relatively simple way of overcoming this problem. If as large a part as possible of the materials is made self-instructional, the role of the professor can be reduced to that of a consultant for one or two hours per week, instead of a teacher for three, four, or five hours per week. In such a situation most teachers could carry two other courses and a language course, or they could teach two or three language courses instead of one other course. With the advances in programmed instruction that have taken place during the last 15 years, courses of the sort just described are very practical. The programmed instruction can be either on paper or through a computer; it is the method, not the means, that is important.

Taking into account the considerations discussed above, let us now turn to the question of what materials we need for the Slavic languages. I will exclude Russian from further discussion, since many or most of the materials we need for Russian already exist, and the others are likely to be produced in response to specific needs, just as such materials are produced for French, Spanish, and German. Even in a time of academic recession, Russian materials are sufficiently profitable for both author and publisher to remove any need for subsidy or special arrangements to have them produced.

In ideal terms, we should have for each language the following: first, an introductory four-skill (reading, writing, speaking, and understanding) text with key and tapes; this text should be as self-instructional as possible. Second, a text similar to that of point one, but aimed at students who already know Russian and containing explicit comparisons of the two languages. Third, a text for persons who require only a reading knowledge of the language. This text should also have a key and be as self-instructional as possible, although tapes are obviously not needed, except perhaps for a brief record or tape to allow the student to acquire a good pronunciation. The fourth need is for a reading text for persons who know Russian.

The fifth need is for at least a second-year text to follow the first-year texts of points one and two. Ideally, there should be two separate texts, but this is not practical, and the best that one can hope for is notes and additional material designed to help the student familiar with Russian. Third-year texts at least for the more important languages, such as Polish, are also desirable, but they are likely to come into being only through a labor of love, since their priority is simply too low to compete for any funds currently available or likely to become available. A sixth type of textbook is four-skill materials for secondary schools. Students at the secondary-school level do not normally know Russian already, nor are they primarily interested only in a reading knowledge, so only one type of text is required.

The seventh category is readers of various types. While I would not deny the usefulness of good readers, I would point out that they can be made much less necessary if certain other materials are adequate. A good textbook, whether for the four-skill approach or for reading only, should have a sufficient amount, even an abundance, of graded reading material in a variety of fields, and this reading should be integrated into the text. If an adequate dictionary and reference grammar are available, they will remove most of the remaining urgency for compiling readers. Where adequate

dictionaries and reference grammars are not available, a reader becomes a much more important tool for learning a language. If a student has gone through an adequate textbook and has a good dictionary available, he should be able to read ordinary texts in the areas of his interest without difficulty.

A good reference grammar, item number eight, is absolutely essential for the student working alone and is very useful even when the student has a trained teacher available for questioning. A clear distinction should be made between a reference grammar, for general use, and a linguistic description, which will probably present the material in terse form and with terminology that is impenetrable for the average student. A good linguistic description is necessary before we can produce a good reference grammar, but they are not the same thing.

If the reference grammar is written for speakers of English, it should include comparison of English and the target language; comparison with Russian is also highly desirable. While a textbook will naturally include much comparison with English (and Russian), many advanced points will come up only in a reference grammar. If they are not covered in the reference grammar, then a set of contrastive materials covering specific points is desirable. An example of such materials is the set of booklets on Romanian produced under the editorship of James Augerot. Such materials may be listed as point ten.

The eleventh necessity is a pair of good, full-size bilingual dictionaries, from the target language to English and from English to the target language. In the best of all possible worlds, both of these dictionaries should be prepared specially for the needs of English-speaking students of the target language, and not for speakers of the target language who are learning English. In actual practice, some dictionaries of the latter type come close to being adequate for the needs of English speakers as well, and it would not be worth the time and money to produce a completely new dictionary.

Many people feel that a twelfth item should be a pair of student dictionaries. My own experience in working with "student" dictionaries in Russian and Serbo-Croatian, as well as in some non-Slavic languages, is that the preparation of such dictionaries is a waste of time. Most of the information in "student" dictionaries should also be in a full-sized dictionary, and the rest of it should be in the textbook or reference grammar. Student dictionaries may be of some use to carry around for conversational purposes, but they are seldom adequate for reading or writing.

For conversation, we may note phrase books and topical vocabulary lists as a thirteenth desideratum. A good phrase book gives much information that is hard or impossible to find in a dictionary, and it can also be an effective classroom aid for conversation.

Tests, both oral and written, comprise a fourteenth point on our list. Word counts and studies of the frequency and distribution of morphological, syntactic, and derivational patterns are a fifteenth item. The final item is an up-to-date and annotated bibliography. While a number of other things would be of use, the sixteen listed constitute those generally considered most important.

In principle it is desirable to have all of the materials listed above for each of the Slavic languages, but we must establish a set of priorities to fit the existing situation. It seems to me that three factors enter here: first, the relative importance of the language itself; second, the relative importance of the type of materials (to take the obvious, a good basic course is more important than a bibliography or a learner's dictionary); and third, the degree to which existing materials are satisfactory. Comparing these three factors is a very difficult task, since it involves deciding, for example, whether greater usefulness is to be derived from composing a dictionary for one language where none exists, redoing a somewhat inadequate reference grammar in a second language, or rewriting a very poor basic course for a third language.

The question of relative importance of the languages is not just a matter of number of speakers or even whether it is an official language of a state or not. Albanian, Ukrainian, and Serbo-Croatian furnish a good set of examples: Albanian is the language of an independent state, but it is not necessarily more important than Ukrainian, which has about 20 times as many speakers; on the other hand, the fact that Ukrainian has at least 3 times as many native speakers as Serbo-Croatian does not mean that it is even as important to us as Serbo-Croatian. Serbo-Croatian is not only the chief language of a state which is of great interest to the United States, it is also the second language of the rest of the people of that state and as such plays a special role that Ukrainian does not play.

Instead of the three levels of importance listed in the Fife-Nielsen report, I would propose five: 1) Russian; 2) Bulgarian, Czech, Hungarian, Polish, Romanian, and Serbo-Croatian; 3) Albanian and Ukrainian; 4) Byelorussian, Latvian, Lithuanian, Macedonian, Slovak, and Slovenian; 5) Upper and Lower Lusatian. As I have stated earlier, Russian does not seem to require additional support. Upper and Lower Lusatian are of interest mostly to linguists and folklorists, so they may be excluded from further consideration. Since I have been informed that Hungarian and Romanian will be covered in other reports, they will also be left out of further discussion. This leaves the following languages to consider: 1) Bulgarian, Czech, Polish, and Serbo-Croatian; 2) Albanian and Ukrainian; 3) Byelorussian, Latvian, Lithuanian, Macedonian, Slovak, and Slovenian, twelve languages in all.

The relative importance of the various types of materials is a more complicated (and disputed) question, but at least three things are a *sine qua non*: an introductory course, bilingual dictionaries, and a reference grammar. When speaking of an introductory course, we are really speaking of from two to five items. The minimum is a four-skill course and a reading course; for the Slavic languages each of these is required in two versions, one for those with a knowledge of Russian and one for those without. While an introductory Byelorussian course for secondary schools would hardly be on anybody's list of essential materials, such a course for Polish or the other languages of category 1 might well be. I would personally add a good bibliography to the list of the most important materials. This is particularly the case for specialists who want to use the language for research purposes: a biologist interested in the flora of Bulgaria, for example, needs to be able to find out about whatever specialized dictionaries may exist, both monolingual and bilingual.

Second- and third-year texts might well be ranked in second place with readers on two or three levels of difficulty and in various fields.

Tests, contrastive materials, and phrasebooks occupy third place, with learner's dictionaries and word counts fourth. For the Slavic and Baltic languages no special works on the writing system are necessary, since the

writing systems of those languages, unlike Chinese or Japanese, do not present any difficulties that cannot be covered fully in the introductory text or the reference grammar. Most of the other specialized aids that one might name, such as lists of idioms or synonyms, grammatical information on declension and conjugation, lists of accent patterns and the words that belong to them, materials on word-formation, root-lists, etc., can best be handled as part of one or more of the three basic tools: the textbook, the dictionary, or the reference grammar.

One final point must be raised before proceeding to a language-by-language survey of available materials. This is the problem of accessibility and price of materials. The accessibility problem is really of two sorts: some materials are out of print, others exist only in a very limited number of copies in such places as the DLI or various university archives. Many, perhaps most, of the materials we have at present for the study of several East European languages have been printed in the countries of Eastern Europe, where the publishing industry normally prints only as many copies of a book as can be sold in a relatively short period: six months or a year. Reprints sometimes never appear, and even when they do it is usually a number of years before they can get in the publishing plan and be produced. A typical example is the case of the only full-size Bulgarian-English dictionary. It was published in Sofia in 1961 in an edition of just over 15,000 copies. It disappeared from bookstores in Bulgaria in a matter of weeks, and the stock of copies purchased by bookstores in the West lasted only for two or three years. For more than ten years now, students of Bulgarian have not been able to get an adequate dictionary. A new, even larger, Bulgarian-English dictionary exists in manuscript, but it will not be out for at least another year, and then the whole cycle will be repeated again. In this particular case, an American publisher is negotiating with the Bulgarians for the right to bring out an American edition, which would keep the book available, but this is an exception to the general situation. Moreover, some American editions are sold at piratical prices, of which more below.

For some languages, the only available courses or the only satisfactory courses are multi-volume works from the DLI or the Indiana Univ. Intensive Language Center which exist only in a few copies, and reproduction by Xerox or other means on an individual basis is prohibitively expensive. Printing such large works is also out of the question, since very few of them would repay the investment, and the retail price would put them beyond the reach of most students. The Bulgarian Basic Course of the DLI comprises 16 volumes! If such materials are to be made available, they must be skillfully reduced in size.

The price of materials is a problem mostly because of the near-monopoly that publishers enjoy in the East European field. A good example is that of the new Serbo-Croatian-English dictionary by Morton Benson. It is published in the United States by the Univ. of Pennsylvania Press, which charges $28.00 for it, in spite of the fact that the work on it was done under an OE grant and typesetting was largely financed by an ACLS grant. Since this is the only adequate Serbo-Croatian-English dictionary, a student of the language really has very little choice: he can either enrich the Univ. of Pennsylvania Press unreasonably, or he can do without a vital work. Many East European countries follow a policy of special high export prices for books sent to the West: Czech books, for example, normally cost from three to four times as much in the West as they do in Czechoslovakia. The Oxford and Cambridge University Presses in England follow a pattern of charging approximately 50% more in the USA than in England for the same book. This problem must be solved in some way, since the average student simply cannot afford to pay the prices that many publishers now ask for basic materials.

II

Let us now consider, language by language, what materials exist from the sixteen categories discussed above. In certain of the categories, nothing exists for any of the languages. No four-skill basic course for students with a knowledge of Russian has been produced for any language, nor has a reading course in the true sense of the term been written for students without Russian. There are courses which concentrate on reading, but they are merely traditional grammar-translation courses which pay only lip-service to speaking and comprehension. One reading course for students with Russian, *Czech for Slavists*, has been completed by Michael Heim. It has not yet been published and I have not been able to examine a copy. No materials for secondary schools are available for any of the languages. There are books in Czech, Slovak, Polish, Serbo-Croatian, and Ukrainian that were written for a broad audience that might include high-school students, but none of them is adequate at any level. Thus four of the first five categories are a complete blank, with the possible exception of the Heim book.

Categories twelve and sixteen also are empty; there are adequate beginner's bibliographies in the two Horecky bibliographies on the area, but they do not give the information that any serious student would need, and they are fast becoming out of date. There are no student dictionaries for any of the languages. The so-called student dictionary of Magner is no more than a small-size ordinary dictionary of Serbo-Croatian. Contrastive materials, point ten, exist in part for some of the languages, such as Polish and Serbo-Croatian, but the contrastive projects for those languages have not yet produced all-around studies of sufficient depth and breadth. There is an interesting, but limited contrastive grammar of Bulgarian and English and another poor one of Ukrainian and English, but point ten is really still blank for the purposes of this survey. There are no second- or third-year materials for any language.

In this language-by-language list, I will not attempt to justify most of my evaluations of materials, since that would take far too much space for a working paper. Other teachers might not agree with some of my evaluations, but I have tried to be as objective as possible. In listing materials, I will not normally give full bibliographical citations, since specialists in the area will be familiar with most or all of the materials. In fields where some materials exist but are not all satisfactory or do not cover all the required areas, as is the state with Polish readers, I will attempt to summarize the situation and will not try to evaluate each individual book. In general, I will consider only books in English, since the great majority of American students cannot use French, German, or Russian well enough to learn a language through them. Finally, an occasional citation will be indefinite because I can't locate the necessary data in the time at hand. I have no data on available tests.

Bulgarian: The *Bulgarian Basic Course* in 2 volumes by Carleton Hodge is an adequate textbook, although not without faults. With some revision it could be a first-rate four-skill introductory course. The 2-volume traditional course by M. Marinova et al. is fairly good and could be made much better by revision. Both of these books are out of print at present. The *Bulgarian Basic Course* of the DLI is 16 volumes, which makes it more or less useless on practical grounds; I have not been able to examine it for quality. The Ghinina textbook is poor, the Lord book is almost worthless. The Lord-Bynum and Pinto readers do not have sufficient notes, etc. to make them good language-teaching books, and the price of the Lord-Bynum

book is too high for most classes. I have not been able to examine the Hodge reader. There is no reference grammar or full linguistic description, although partial materials, such as Aronson's book, do exist. Large and fairly good dictionaries exist in both B-E and E-B versions, but they are aimed at Bulgarian speakers and give no grammatical or accent information. They are also out of print. There is a good phrase book by Vladimir and Marija Filipov Stojanov, but it is long out of print. Another phrase book published in Sofia in 1963 is not as satisfactory. Work on a word-count and allied information is underway in Bulgaria on a corpus of six million words, but nothing has been published yet.

Czech: There is an abundance of elementary Czech courses, both published and in manuscript (I know of at least 4 finished books in manuscript), although whether any of them will really satisfy the four-skill requirement with key and tapes is doubtful; none of the published ones do. The reading course for those with Russian, *Czech for Slavists*, by Michael Heim is also in manuscript. A reader for the social sciences and humanities by Worth, Heim, and Meyerstein is in preparation. Harkins' *Anthology of Czech Literature* is really of more use for literature than language courses, although it can be used in language courses. A reference grammar by Havránek and Jedlička has been translated from Czech and is currently looking for a publisher. Adequate linguistic descriptions exist in Czech, English, and other languages. Medium-size bilingual dictionaries exist in both directions, but they are not reputed to be very good and they are aimed at speakers of Czech. Several phrase books exist, and work on a word count is apparently progressing in Czechoslovakia.

Polish: A good four-skill course by Schenker meets the need here. There are several readers either out or in preparation. A reference grammar is in press, and adequate linguistic descriptions are available in English. Two good Polish-English and a good English-Polish dictionary are in print. Several phrase books exist, and a word-count is being prepared in Poland. It should be mentioned that at least one good traditional Polish grammar also exists: *Essentials of Polish Grammar for English-Speaking Students*, by M. Patkaniowska, which is a large and rather complete course, in spite of the name.

Serbo-Croatian: *Serbo-Croatian Basic Course* in 2 volumes by Carleton Hodge is an adequate four-skill course, and there are several other texts in print or in preparation which cover the material in a traditional grammar-translation-reading manner. There is no satisfactory reader, but one can make do for literature (I have not been able to examine the FSI readers). We really need some good readers. No reference grammar exists either in English or in Serbo-Croatian, although enough materials exist in Serbo-Croatian that a person with the proper background could write a reference grammar of fair quality. The linguistic descriptions are not really adequate, but some things do exist. We have a good, although not quite large enough, Serbo-Croatian-English dictionary by Morton Benson, and he is beginning work on a companion E-SC volume. There are a number of large E-SC dictionaries published in Yugoslavia at various times. Magner's student dictionary is not adequate. A number of useful phrase books have been published. I know of no word count.

Albanian: Nothing satisfactory exists for Albanian. The course by Newmark and Haznedari, with added drills by Kazazis, seems to be in need of major revision, and nothing else even comes close to filling our needs.

Ukrainian: I have not been able to examine the 22-volume DLI course, but none of the other texts available is satisfactory. Two courses are in preparation (one, by Danilo Struk of the University of Toronto,is almost ready to publish), but they will probably both be fairly traditional grammar-translation courses. There are no readers or reference grammars, and the linguistic descriptions are seriously inadequate. There is a very good Ukrainian-English dictionary designed for speakers of both languages, but the English-Ukrainian ones are weak. There is a phraseological dictionary designed for the Ukrainian student studying English literature, but there is no adequate phrase book for every-day use. I know of no word counts.

Byelorussian: There is nothing for Byelorussian.

Latvian: No four-skill course exists. Lazdiņa's *Teach Yourself Latvian* is not really successful even as a traditional grammar-translation course. I have not been able to examine Yegerlehner's *Spoken Latvian*, but it seems to be almost exclusively conversational, from the description in Blass-Johnson-Gage. There are no readers, but a reference grammar has been announced by Mouton & Co. Bilingual dictionaries of adequate size exist, both Latvian-English and English-Latvian, but they are aimed at speakers of Latvian and do not include information that an English speaker must have. They also are published in Soviet Latvia, which means that they don't stay in print very long. There is at least one phrase book and a word count is coming out in parts from Riga.

Lithuanian: The Dambriunas-Klimas-Schmalstieg *Introduction to Modern Lithuanian* is quite good, except that it does not provide enough speaking practice. It also lacks a key and tapes or records. I have not been able to examine Robinett's *Spoken Lithuanian* or the FSI book of the same title. The Schmalstieg-Klimas reader is very good but is too small to provide any more than the barest introduction. No reference grammar exists, and the linguistic descriptions are not completely adequate. The existing bilingual dictionaries are not large enough, do not include grammatical and accent information necessary for an English speaker, and are published in Soviet Lithuania, with the attendant problems of availability. The Lalis dictionary published in the USA, is a half-century out of date. There is a fairly useful phrase book; I know of no word counts.

Macedonian: The Tošev-Stefanija *Textbook of the Macedonian Language* is unbelievably bad. Milivojevic has done a reader which has not been published and which I have not seen. Lunt's *Grammar of the Macedonian Literary Language* is very good, but is not really large enough to be an adequate reference grammar, and since it was written only six or seven years after Macedonian became an official language, it has been seriously antiquated by the past twenty years of development in the language. The only Macedonian-English dictionary is a pocket-size one, and the only E-M dictionary is not much larger. A large E-M dictionary project has been started in Skopje with American participation, but the final result is not likely to be available for several years. There are no phrase books or words counts that I know of.

Slovak: The Hrobak text is inadequate even as a traditional course. I have not been able to examine the Mikofsky-Singer *Spoken Slovak*. There are no readers or reference grammars, although adequate linguistic descriptions in Slovak seem to exist. The various bilingual dictionaries, including the big new Slovak-English one published in the USA (see Isačenko's review in *SEEJ*) are not adequate. I do not know of phrase books or word counts.

Slovenian: The Toporišič book, *Zakaj ne po slovensko*, is not an adequate course, although it does have six small records for pronunciation. There is nothing else that would serve as an introductory course, and there is no reader. Rado Lencek has a reference grammar finished in manuscript. Linguistic descriptions are definitely not adequate, particularly of the spoken language. The existing bilingual dictionaries are too small and are aimed at Slovenes. I am informed that Joseph Paternost has abandoned the project to produce Slovenian-English and English-Slovenian dictionaries in cooperation with scholars from Slovenia. There is no adequate phrase book and I know of no word counts.

III

If we try to use the above information to produce a list of priorities for the production of further materials, I would suggest the following. First priority goes to basic four-skill courses for Albanian, Byelorussian, Latvian, Macedonian, Slovak, and Slovenian; reference grammars for all of the languages except Czech, Polish, and Slovenian; full-size dictionaries for Albanian in both directions, Byelorussian in both directions, Latvian-English, Lithuanian-English, and Macedonian-English (one might also wish to add Czech-English, Slovak-English, and Slovenian-English); and bibliographies for all of the languages. One might possibly wish to remove Byelorussian to the next level down because of its closeness to Russian and the adequate grammars and dictionaries in Russian for Byelorussian, which means that a person who learns Russian can learn to read Byelorussian without great additional effort.

Second priority I would attach to preparing reading courses for all of the languages, to preparing second-year materials for Polish, Czech, Serbo-Croatian, and Bulgarian (possibly Ukrainian as well), and to preparing some readers for some of the languages (especially those like Albanian, Latvian, and Lithuanian, which are the most difficult and have the least other aids available). Preparing reading courses for those with a knowledge of Russian should probably also be ranked here.

Beyond this point the factors become so varied and complicated that it is very difficult to make a decision; moreover, actual decisions will probably depend as much upon available personnel and money as upon priorities.

The limited time available to prepare this paper did not permit me to examine certain materials, nor did it give me the opportunity to make exhaustive inquiries about work in progress, so some of the above conclusions are subject to change, but they at least provide a starting point for further discussions.

Charles E. Gribble
Indiana University